

1 KEVIN V. RYAN (CASBN 118321)  
2 United States Attorney

3 MARK L. KROTOSKI (CASBN 138549)  
4 Chief, Criminal Division

5 HAYWOOD S. GILLIAM, JR. (CASBN 172732)  
6 DAVID DENIER (CASBN 95024)  
7 Assistant United States Attorneys

8 450 Golden Gate Avenue, Box 36055  
9 San Francisco, California 94102-3495  
10 Telephone: (415) 436-7200  
11 FAX: (415) 436-7234  
12 E-mail: [haywood.gilliam@usdoj.gov](mailto:haywood.gilliam@usdoj.gov)  
13 [david.denier@usdoj.gov](mailto:david.denier@usdoj.gov)

14 Attorneys for Plaintiff

15  
16 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
17 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
18 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

19 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, ) No. CR 06-0565 SI  
20 Plaintiff, ) [PROPOSED] ORDER EXCLUDING  
21 v. ) TIME  
22 PRISCILLA HUNTER, )  
23 MICHELLE CAMPBELL, )  
24 IRIS MARTINEZ, )  
MICHAEL HUNTER, )  
DARLENE CRABTREE, )  
ALLAN CRABTREE, and )  
FRED NAREDO, )  
Defendants. )

25 This matter came before the Court on September 8, 2006 for a status conference. All  
26 defendants appeared with counsel. At the hearing, counsel for the United States explained that  
27 approximately 80 boxes of discovery have been made available for review by defense counsel.  
28

[PROPOSED] ORDER EXCLUDING TIME  
CR 06-0565 SI

1 The parties explained that they plan to meet and confer promptly with the Court's CJA discovery  
 2 coordinator to discuss a plan for cost-effectively and expeditiously distributing discovery  
 3 materials to defense counsel.

4 Counsel for the government and for the defendants, as well as each defendant, agreed,  
 5 and the Court found, that the exclusion of time between September 8, 2006 and December 1,  
 6 2006 was appropriate under the Speedy Trial Act, Title 18, United States Code, Sections  
 7 3161(h)(8)(A) and (h)(B)(ii) and (iv), based on the complexity of the case and the need to avoid  
 8 denying defense counsel the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, given the large  
 9 volume of discovery to be reviewed. The parties agreed that the ends of justice served by  
 10 granting the requested continuance outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a  
 11 speedy trial.

12 For the foregoing reasons, and those discussed on the record at the September 8, 2006  
 13 status conference, and good cause appearing, the Court HEREBY ORDERS the period between  
 14 September 8, 2006 and December 1, 2006 excluded from the speedy trial calculation under Title  
 15 18, United States Code, Sections 3161(h)(8)(A) and (h)(B)(ii) and (iv). The Court finds  
 16 exclusion appropriate based on the complexity of this matter and the need to avoid denying  
 17 defense counsel the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the  
 18 exercise of due diligence. The Court finds that the ends of justice served by granting the  
 19 requested continuance outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial  
 20 and in the prompt disposition of criminal cases.

21  
 22  
 23 DATED: 9/8/06

  
 24 SUSAN ILLSTON  
 United States District Judge  
 25  
 26  
 27  
 28